

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated September 18, 2008, claims 1-27 were rejected and claims 28-62 were subject to restriction. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Restriction Requirement

The Examiner indicated in the Restriction Requirement dated September 18, 2008 that claims 28-62, submitted in the previous amendment, were directed to an invention independent to original claims 1-27, and thus constructively elected claims 1-27, with claims 28-62 withdrawn.

Applicants provisionally elect claims 1, 3, 5-7, 18, and 23 according to the constructive election. Claims 2, 4, 8-17, 19-22, and 24-27 are canceled.

However, Applicants have amended claims 29-45 and 47-55 such that they depend on constructively elected claims 1 and 23. Similarly, claim 57 has been amended to correspond to constructively elected claims 1 and 23; claims 58-62 depend on claim 57. Claims 28, 46, and 56 are canceled. As a result of these amendments, Applicants submit that all claims now pending recite the similar limitations and thus no additional "independent or distinct" invention subject to Restriction, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.143.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC §102(e) in View of Reese/ Interview Summary

On September 29, 2008, a brief telephone call took place between Examiner McLean and Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush regarding the pending Restriction Requirement and status of the case. The Examiner confirmed that the action was in fact a Restriction Requirement and that the Applicants thus had an opportunity to respond to the constructive election. The substance of the claims was not discussed.

Applicants here discuss rejections presented in the Office Action of February 22, 2008. In that action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Reese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,298,512). This rejection is traversed with respect currently pending claims.

Independent claims 1, 23, and 57 respectively recite a printer, method, and computer program product for printing time-based media. Claim 23 is representative:

In a printer with an embedded multimedia server, a method for printing time-based media content comprising:
performing multimedia content processing, comprising:
monitoring streaming media content from a time-based media source input to the printer;
selecting a portion of the streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria;
indexing the selected portion of the streaming media content;
constructing a storable representation for the selected portion of the streaming media content; and
generating a printout of the storable representation.

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed by Reese. Reese discloses a printer with an embedded database driver to convert data input to a database compatible format. The Examiner alleged that Reese describes monitoring multimedia content based on criteria, indexing a content selection based on criteria, and generating an index document for the content selection in Column 4, lines 11-19 (The embedded web server enables the printer to

provide a web page that allows users to interact with the printer in order to control and/or provide information that is to be entered into a database. The information can include the database server name, database engine type, and database login information. Additionally, the web page might allow users to add additional ODBC data sources so that the printer could support proprietary or less popular database engines that are not already loaded in the printer memory). *See Office Action at page 11.* The embedded web server of Reese processes only static web pages, but is unable to monitor *streaming media content*, select a portion of the *streaming media content*, or index the selected portion of the *streaming media content* as recited in claims 28, 46, and 57. This difference is not trivial. Monitoring, selecting, and indexing streaming media requires significantly more sophisticated processing than necessary for static media, making the claimed multimedia server more difficult, and less likely, to be embedded in a printer device. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 23, and 57 are patentably distinguishable over Reese.

Claims 3, 5-7, 18, 29, 45, 47-55, and 58-62 variously depend from claims 1, 23, 57, and 40, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited reference and which recite additional features not shown in the cited reference. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 3, 5-7, 18, 29, 45, 47-55, and 58-62 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

In addition, with respect to claims 35, 50, and 58, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of “receiving user input... **indicating a participant speaker,**” “segmenting” and “indexing” the streaming media content based on the speaker in the recorded video meeting, nor “selecting a media clip...illustrating a time period” when the speaker is speaking in the recorded video meeting. Thus claims 35, 50, and 58, and their

dependents, claims 36-40, 51-55, and 59, are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

In addition, with respect to claims 3, 41, and 60, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Reese of receiving a document in a print job, extracting a URL from the document, retrieving a web page identified by the referenced URL, constructing a printable representation of the web page, associating the printable representation of the web page with a thumbnail image, nor displaying the thumbnail image in an embedded printer display. Thus, claims 3, 41, and 60, and their dependents, claims 42-45 and 61-62, are further distinguishable over Reese for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 5-7, 18, 23, 29-45, 47-55, and 57-62 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 20, 2008

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush
Registration No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200